

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

Rodney Parker,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C/A No.: 5:13-cv-02795-TLW
vs.)	
)	
Warden Stevenson; Major Sutton; Captain)	
Washington; Lt. Jackson; Sgt. Esterline;)	
Sct. JC Williams; Ofc. Beckett; Ofc.)	
McCoy; Ofc. Suarez; Ofc. Dooley; Nurse)	
K. McCullough; and Nurse Jane Doe,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Rodney Parker, a pro se inmate, filed this action on October 15, 2013, alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Doc. #1. This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed on October 30, 2014, by Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, Doc. #80-1, to whom this case was previously assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment and dismiss the case. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on November 17, 2014. Doc. #82. The matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court has reviewed the Report and the objections. In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections.... The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate

judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. In addition, the Court has carefully reviewed the record, including the medical summaries and reports. Having carefully reviewed the record, Report, and objections, the Court hereby **ACCEPTS** the Report. The Plaintiff's objections, Doc. #82, are **OVERRULED**. The Defendants' motion for summary judgment, Doc. #61, is **GRANTED**. The Complaint is hereby **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

March 27, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina